

Realistic Expectations for ELR and PHIN: Lessons Learned During Testing of the NBS

J. A. Magnuson, PhD, RS

ELR in One Word – ‘Complicated’

- Many ELR variables/variations
 - Currently occurring
 - Continuing into foreseeable future
- Main categories of variables
 - Format
 - Content
 - Transmission Methodologies

General ELR Format Variations

- HL7
 - Versions – 2.2, 2.3.z, 2.3.1, 2.4, 2.5, 3.0
 - “Flavors” of each version between labs
 - Parent-child lab differences
- Other text
 - Comma-separated, tab-separated
- Spreadsheet, database, etc.
 - .xls, .dbf, .mdb

National Picture – HL7 Versions Accepted*


None

2.3.z

2.3.1

2.3.z+2.3.1

>two



* Self-identified states, ELR National Teleconference Group website

General ELR Content Variations

- Record level
 - Batch reporting
 - Single-record web entry
- Coding
 - Standards - LOINC, SNOMED, HL7, others
 - Local code sets
- Available fields


General ELR Transmission Variations

- Control issues
 - Lab willingness to install external software/hardware
 - Who controls security? Ex. Modem - Server
- Methodologies
 - PHIN MS
 - VPN, sFTP
 - Modem
 - Web portals

Oregon ELR

- ELR program began in 2000
- Base - Sybase translation and messaging applications
- State currently testing the NEDSS Base System for utility within our environment

Oregon ELR Nucleus



Oregon ELR Format Variations

- All Oregon ELR (source data) using HL7 format
- But - different versions and 'flavors'
 - +/- File and Batch segments
 - Subcomponents – some labs produce, others cannot; also different subcomponent content
 - Notes – sometimes appear in NTEs, sometimes in OBXs
 - +/- Z segment (most labs use 2.3.z or 2.3.1)
 - Z segment differences – not all lab partners use our regional standard HL7 message
 - CR/CRLF variations – depend on source app

Oregon ELR Format Variations

- ELR data distributed to partners in various formats
 - State partners: their choice of formats. Current report formats include .dbf, .mdb, .xls
 - LHD Automated fax (.txt) – used by all counties
 - LHD pilot – direct data transfer (.mdb, .xls, .dbf)
- ELR-associated data includes these formats as well as XML

Oregon ELR Content Variations

- Record level
 - Batch reporting
 - Single-record files
- Coding
 - LOINC, SNOMED, ICD (for ED reporting), HL7
 - Local code sets - many
- Available fields - examples
 - Reference range
 - Demographic information

Oregon ELR Transmission Variations

- Current Supported Methodologies
 - VPN (Virtual Private Network)
 - sFTP (secure File Transfer Protocol)
 - Asynchronous modem
 - File pick-up from secure web site
- Control issues
 - Provide free client VPN software, but some partners reluctant to allow outside software
 - Modem transfer security - support dial-out but not dial-in


Oregon ELR Enhancements – An Integrated Subsystem

- Current extensions from the ELR nucleus
 - Emergency Department Surveillance
 - LHD Communicable Disease Data Exchange pilots
 - County reports transmitted to state system
 - Direct electronic transfer of lab data to counties
 - Perinatal Hepatitis B Data Interchange
 - Miscellaneous data interchange – Medical Examiner
 - SARS – XML to CDC

Oregon ELR Enhancements – An Integrated Subsystem

- Current extensions from the ELR nucleus
- Future extensions
 - Pathology Reporting – Cancer Registry
 - Data interchange with neighboring states
 - Poison Control Data
 - Hepatitis C reporting

Oregon ELR Overview




All counties receive ELR data via automated fax


15 counties have bi-directional data flow,
receiving + transmitting data

4 counties transmit hep b data

Oregon ELR Overview



Emergency Department Reporting



ED reports differ from lab data:
A) ICD Codes
B) Clinical data (temperature, respiration rate, pulse, etc.)


ED data merged with ELR data for several state programs, but not forwarded to LHDs


NBS Possibilities

- Oregon Goal – Retain and enhance existing ELR functionalities
 - Must maintain current interfaces
 - Have flexibility to add new interfaces
- How to incorporate existing ELR with NBS?
 - Options identified for data import into NBS
 - Pros and Cons determined

PHIN MS and NBS


- PHIN Messaging System - PHIN MS
- NEDSS Base System – NBS
- Oregon currently testing the NBS in our environment





State PHINMS and NBS

State firewall




DHS

Office of Disease Prevention &
Epidemiology

ELR Data Import Options

- Direct messaging from laboratories into the NBS




Direct Messaging from Laboratories into the NBS

- Pro: No additional data steps/setup
- Con: Problematic issues include
 - Accommodation of variety of HL7 formats and 'flavors'
 - Need to support extensive local code sets (current reality in Oregon)
 - Developing new interfaces not easy

ELR Data Import Options

- Direct messaging from laboratories into the NBS
- Direct data import - into the NBS Operational Data Store/Message In database - from the ELR database




Direct Data Import into NBS db from an ELR Database

- Pro:
 - Standardization, correction, and normalization of **format**, **content**, and **coding** occurs as reports process into ELR db, ∴ easier import to NBS
 - Ability to create flexible and new interfaces
 - Control acceptance of HL7 versions, local coding, and non-HL7 message formats
- Con: Requires effort to set up data import processes

ELR Data Import Options

- Direct messaging from laboratories into the NBS
- Direct data import - into the NBS Operational Data Store/Message In database - from the ELR database
- Messaging import from the ELR database into NBS Receiver



Messaging Import from ELR Database into NBS Receiver

- Pro:
 - All of the Pros from previous option
- Con:
 - Problematic version control for messaging
 - As NBS evolves, changes in HL7 versions accepted must be matched by HL7 message from ELR db

Data Import Considerations

- Important to offer options to our trading partners
- An established ELR system has different considerations than a developing system
- Current and future ELR needs will impact a choice between the three import options
- Oregon current plan, option #2: Direct data import into the NBS db from the ELR database

Summary

- Significant time and expertise are necessary to maintain existing interfaces, add new ones
- Flexibility critical to retaining and enhancing existing ELR functionalities
- It is unreasonable to expect any tool to support all these needs and variables "out of the box"